REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 13, 2004. Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 24 are in the application, of which Claims 1 to 8, 10 to 19 and 24 have been allowed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The continued indication of allowance of most of the claims is acknowledged with appreciation.

Claims 20 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,256,111 (Rijavec). In response, Claim 20 has been amended so as to specify that there is a selection between calibration information received from a computer and calibration information generated by a printing apparatus, and that the selection is based on a difference between these calibration informations. As such, Claim 20 recites subject matter somewhat similar to that of the allowed claims, except that the difference in calibration informations does not necessarily exceed a predetermined value. Nevertheless, Claim 20 is believed to be allowable, for at least the following reasons.

As amended, Claim 20 relates to a printing apparatus comprising first and second holding means for respectively holding calibration information received from computer or from the printing apparatus. A selection is made between the calibration information held by the first holding means and the calibration information held by the second holding means, and the selection is based on a difference between the calibration

informations. The selected calibration information is selected to be used for correcting an input image.

By virtue of the foregoing, a rational basis is provided for making a selection between calibration information received from a computer and calibration information generated by the printing apparatus itself.

Rijavec describes a printing system in which calibration information may be updated for each printer in the system individually. As seen by Applicants, however, Rijavec does not describe two different types of calibration information, that is, calibration information received from a computer and calibration information generated in the printing apparatus itself. Rather, Rijavec describes calibration information originating only from a single source, and does not describe a system implementing calibration in both the computer and the printer.

It is clear that the Office Action disagrees with this view of Rijavec, and page 2 thereof clearly specifies that the Rijavec system discloses a first calibration function provided by host device 102 and a second calibration function generated in a printer. Support for this is apparently based on column 3 of Rijavec, which the Office Action summarizes as follows: "Note that the printer calibration is described as 'implemented in the printers 110, 116 as well'." However, the entire passage at lines 52 to 59 of column 3 reads as follows:

> "Although the scaling, transfer function, and halftoning processes are described as being performed in the computer 106, 108 or the server 102, the invention may be advantageously practiced in other embodiments. For example, the transfer function and/or halftoning process may be implemented in the printers 110-116 as well, as these devices often

> have a resident central processing unit (CPU) and memory with sufficient capability."

Thus, Rijavec did not say that "printer calibration" was implemented in printers 110-116; rather, Rijavec very clearly stated that "transfer function and/or halftoning process" may be implemented in these printers. Rijavec's transfer function and/or halftoning processes are different from calibration information[1/], such that Applicant maintains his position that Rijavec describes only a single source of calibration information, and not calibration information both from a computer and generated in the printing apparatus itself.

Moreover, and since Rijavec describes only a single source of calibration information, it is clear that Rijavec does not describe a selection between calibration information received from a computer and calibration information generated in the printing apparatus itself, much less a selection based on a difference between these calibration informations.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 20 is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

[1/]Although Rijavec's transfer function and/or halftoning processes are different from calibration information, it is equally true that the transfer function and/or halftoning process might use the calibration information for correcting an input image. However, use of calibration information does not somehow transform Rijavec's transfer function and/or halftoning process into calibration information.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 93271v1